DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 895 EC 222 053

TITLE The General Education/Special Education Interface Task Force Report.
INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Div. of Special Education.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 49p.; For other reports in this series, see EC 222 054-056.
AVAILABLE FROM Resources in Special Education, 900 J St., Sacramento, CA 95814-2703 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administration; Core Curriculum; *Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Inservice Teacher Education; *Models; Participative Decision Making; Problem Solving; *Program Development; Program Implementation; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; School Involvement; School Role; Special Education; State Standards; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The report of a California task force examines new or revised special education service delivery models which would allow for maximum interaction between special education and general education. After a review of the literature and a 2-day policy forum, the task force concluded that there is no one model appropriate for all schools and all mildly/moderately handicapped children. Each school is encouraged to develop a unified system resulting from: the collaborative effort of the entire staff; available resources; a choice of teaching strategies; and a continuum of services. Anticipated outcomes include increased acquisition of the core curriculum by a greater number of students, a decrease in grade-level retention and the dropout rate, and increased success rate for transition to post-secondary education and/or employment. After an introduction and a statement of findings, the report presents 27 questions and answers about a unified system, followed by separate sections which cover: safeguards, funding, governance, core curriculum, personnel development, staffing, implementation, and evaluation. Each of these topics is presented in the form of identified issues and task force recommendations. Also included are a listing of the task force membership, 26 references, and a glossary of 16 terms. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED314895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The General Education/ Special Education Interface Task Force Report

An Advisory Report to Patrick Campbell, Assistant Superintendent
California Department of Education
Special Education Division

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Wright

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

From
The Task Force on
General Education/
Special Education Interface
September 1988

EC212053

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The General Education/ Special Education Interface Task Force Report

An Advisory Report to Patrick Campbell, Assistant Superintendent
California Department of Education
Special Education Division

From
The General Education/Special Education Interface Task Force Report
September 1988

Other publications from the General Education/Special Education Interface Task Force:

Policy Analysis on Special Education Forum. (Jan. 1988), 95pp.
Policy Analysis on Special Education Forum. (1988), VHS videotape, 21 min.
(Available on loan from Resources in Special Education.)

Special Education Task Force Reports:

General Education / Special Education Interface
Larry P.
Least Restrictive Environment
Model for Program Quality in Special Education
(Available for purchase from Resources in Special Education.)

This publication was edited and prepared for photo-offset production by Resources in Special Education (RiSE) under the direction of the Program, Curriculum, and Training Unit, Special Education Division, California State Department of Education.

Copies of this publication are available from Resources in Special Education, 900 J Street, Sacramento, California 95814-2703.

Copyright ©1989 by Resources in Special Education.

General Education/Special Education Interface Task Force

MEMBERSHIP 1987-1988

CO-CHAIRMEN

Larry Schram, Director
Special Education
El Cajon Valley Union School District

Bob MacMillan, Associate Professor
University of the Pacific
Stockton, California

Special Education Local Planning Area Administrators Association
Mary DiSessa Lantz, Regional Administrator
Riverside County SELPA

Jack Ward, Executive Director
Mendocino County SELPA

Association of California School Administrators
Jon Frieseke, Director
Pupil Personnel Services
Sonoma Valley Unified School District

Special Education Administrators of County Offices
James Gibson, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent
Shasta County Office of Education

California Advisory Commission on Special Education
Marjorie Bourret

California Association of Resource Specialists
Janny Yamate, President CARS
Resource Specialist, Vallejo Unified School District

State Department of Education
Maria Chairez, Consultant
High Risk Youth Unit

Marion Miller, Consultant
Special Education Division

Patty Taylor, Consultant
Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Division

Institutions of Higher Education
Bill Wilson, Chairman
Department of Special Education
San Francisco State University

California Speech, Language, Hearing Association
Robert Powell, Director

California Parent Teachers Association
Harriet Borson

California Association of School Psychologists
Jackie Cheong

Council for Exceptional Children
Ward Downs, President, CEC, 1987-1988
Teacher of the Hearing Impaired
Stockton Unified School District

California Teachers Association
Jim Woodhead, Speech/Language Pathologist
Newark Unified School District

California Association of Private Special Education Schools
Wayne Miyamoto, Executive Director, CAPSES

Parent
Mary Ann Golembesky, Chair
Governmental Affairs, ACLD-California

Field
Carolyn Coffey, Director
Pupil Services
Baldwin Park Unified School District

Stephen Fiss, Assistant Superintendent of Special Services
Alum Rock Union Elementary School District

Peter Gonos, Director
Special Education
San Juan Unified School District, 1987-1988

Pat VeVea, Resource Specialist,
Kern County Superintendent of Schools,
Board Member
Rosedale Union School District

Marcia McClish, SELPA Administrator
West Orange County Special Education Consortium

Janet Van Gelder, Director,
Auxiliary Education
Clovis Unified School District

Virgina Swihart
New Haven Unified School District

NOTE: Representatives of the Honig Informal Advisory Committee and the California School Nurses Organization were invited to participate but did not send representatives to Task Force meetings.

NOTE: The Task Force would like to extend their appreciation to Cindy Lynn First for her perseverance in organizing and editing this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Membership of Task Force iii

Introduction 1

Statement of Findings 5

Questions and Answers about a Unified System 7

Safeguards 11

Funding 14

Governance 17

Core Curriculum 19

Personnel Development 23

Staffing 26

Implementation 28

Evaluation 33

References 39

Glossary 41

Introduction

About one third of California students drop out of high school prior to graduation.[1] Many who do graduate are unprepared to make the transition to the world of work and/or post secondary education. Nationwide, 30% of recent high school graduates are functionally illiterate.[2]

Although a plethora of categorical programs designed to meet the needs of students who are at-risk of failing in school have been developed in the past decade, their very nature sometimes prevents the delivery of an appropriate level of service to these students. Each categorical program has its own eligibility requirements and regulations as to how the resources provided may be expended. Thus, some students who have difficulty succeeding in school are denied extra help because they do not qualify for specialized programs.

California educators have embraced the concept of providing instruction in the core curricular areas to all students. While successful for many, this has not proved to be as feasible for mildly handicapped students and those students in other categorical programs.

The desire to help each child achieve success commensurate with his or her abilities has led to much research and discussion. Prominent educators such as Margaret C. Wang, Maynard C. Reynolds, William Stainback, Susan Stainback and others have argued that such students should not be educated in a program where they leave the regular classroom for special instruction, thus perhaps missing instruction in some core curricular subject. Instead, these educators favor a program whereby the special and general education teachers work together to assist the student without the student leaving the classroom. Other equally prominent educators, including James M. Kauffman, Barbara K. Keogh, and Tanis Bryan, believe that the pullout approach was developed because students were not receiving adequate instruction to meet their specialized needs within the classroom, that it is effective, and that students needn't be deprived of instruction in the core curriculum.

[1] *California 2000, A People in Transition*, (p. 17) Assembly Office of Research, June 1986.

[2] *Educating Students with Learning Disabilities—A Shared Responsibility*, Madeline Will, November, 1986.

In response to these concerns, Patrick Campbell, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction for Special Education, California State Department of Education, appointed a General Education/Special Education Interface Task Force early in 1987 and charged it with:

"The development of new (or revised) service delivery models which could be used at a school site level which would allow for maximum interaction between special education and general education.

"These models would address the following concepts:

1. The consideration and implementation of the Core curriculum with special education students;

2. An emphasis on the development of higher level cognitive skills for special education students;

3. The ability to plan at the local school site how available categorical resources [including Resources Specialist Programs (RSP) and all Designated Instructional Services (DIS)] could be maximized and coordinated;

4. The most efficient utilization of all support personnel in the planning and delivery of services for all students;

5. The consideration of alternative instructional strategies which would best meet the needs of students integrated at the school site i.e., Direct Service versus Consultation Model.

"The models developed would be piloted (on a volunteer basis) in 1988-1989. Strong staff development and evaluation components would be provided by the State Department of Education as integral parts of the piloting."

Organizations invited to participate on the Task Force included The Advisory Commission on Special Education, California Teachers Association, Social Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Directors, Association of California School Administrators, (SEACO) of Education, California Association of Resource Specialists, Honig Informal Advisory Committee, State Department of Education, Institutions of Higher Education, California Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Parent Teachers Association, California Association of School Psychologists, Council for Exceptional

Children, California Association of Private Special Education Schools and California School Nurses Organization. Parents and practitioners in the field of both general and special education also participated.

The Task Force began its work with extensive reading from the literature (see references). Panel presentations of the "New Haven Model" and the "El Cajon Model" included a tour of classes in El Cajon Valley Union School District in San Diego.

At a two-day policy forum, presentations were made by Thomas Skrtic, Associate Professor, University of Kansas, (*An Organizational Analysis of Special Education Reform);* Lawrence Gloeckler, Assistant Commissioner, Office for Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions, New York State Department of Education (*Implementation of Statewide Policy Change*); and Marilyn Friend, Assistant Professor, Northern Illinois University (*Pragmatic Issues in the Development of Consultation Programs in Local School Districts)*

The Task Force recommends that the *Proceedings of the Policy Analysis Forum* be made available to interested parties through Resources in Special Education (RiSE).

The Task Force spent several meetings discussing possible alternatives in service delivery which would be appropriate for California. Each possible approach to correcting perceived problems was found to be inapplicable in some situations.

After considerable study, brainstorming and discussion, the Task Force reached the consensus that there is no one model appropriate for all schools and all children. The Task Force believes there are many individual components and/or alternative systems which will successfully address the needs of the at-risk learner. These range from currently existing systems to a complete restructuring of a school's organization (see section on implementation). Each school wishing to develop a unified system, as recommended by the Task Force, will find components which may be applicable to that school.

The Task Force believes that it is critical for each school site to spend the time needed to thoughtfully develop a plan which will best serve the students at that site, using all available resources and staff strengths found at the site.

In developing our recommendations, the Task Force kept as its focus the needs of mildly and moderately handicapped youngsters. Also considered were the needs of students who are at-risk of failure in school, and yet do not meet the eligibility requirements of the various categorical programs, including special education. The needs of more severely handicapped students have not been addressed in this document.

To adequately address the needs of the student population with which it is concerned, the Task Force firmly believes that the interest and cooperation of all site and district personnel is required. A personal commitment by each individual is a prerequisite to successful change in the delivery systems in order to better meet the needs of all students.

Finally, these recommendations should not be interpreted to mean that the rights of the handicapped children to a free appropriate education should in any way be diminished.

NOTE: The various sections of the report have been written by individuals or small groups. Therefore, the reader may possibly see differences in writing style. It is also noteworthy that consensus of opinion has been achieved on the document unless otherwise noted. The report, although not a perfect manuscript, is a valuable document and the result of considerable effort on the part of Task Force Members.

Statement of Findings

Increasing numbers of students are "falling through the cracks" in the present educational service delivery system in California. These are typically the students who are deemed not eligible for additional services outside the realm of general education. The task force believes that in order to meet the needs of these students and to enhance the learning environment in our schools, the following precepts must be adopted:

- All students are entitled to an appropriate education ensuring the mastery of basic skills and the acquisition of the core curriculum, unless specific alternative goals are designated on a student's special education Individualized Education Program (IEP).

- All students are entitled to be valued as individuals, having their learning strengths acknowledged and having their educational needs adequately addressed in an effective and timely manner.

- High performance expectations must be maintained for all students.

- Provision of services which promote student success is the obligation of the school and is the responsibility of the entire school staff.

- No student may be disenfranchised from receiving appropriate educational assistance because he/she does not "fit" any of the designated criteria for services.

Examination of various approaches and trends led the Task Force to adopt the following beliefs:

- Individual student needs can best be met through a unified system at the school site which involves a team process to focus on student needs. A unified system is a coordinated, collaborative effort among the entire staff at each school site. Through this system an educational program which supports student success can be designed and implemented utilizing all available resources, a choice of teaching strategies, and a continuum of services.

A unified system which supports success for all students may necessitate :

1. Altering the traditional manner of school operation
2. Developing and clarifying roles for staff members
3. Utilizing a wider range of educational approaches

4. Developing curriculum which is aligned with the district's core curriculum and adequately addresses all styles of learning
5. Expanding coordination among school staff
6. Training
7. Enhancing communication with parents

- A unified system of service delivery can occur within individual school sites and in a school district where all departments and programs support the concept and work together cooperatively.

- Successful implementation of a unified system at school sites will require the support of, and collaborative planning among, school board members, parents, community, professional educators and staff at school sites, districts, county offices of education, Special Education Local Planning Areas (SELPAs), the State Department of Education, institutions of higher education and other related agencies.

- The development of successful unified systems will be dependent upon supportive leadership at all levels—federal, state, regional, county, district and school site.

- The unified system developed will be unique to each school site based on the needs of the students. There is not an "ideal" model or service delivery approach. The specific elements of a unified system at each school site consideration of a variety of alternative service delivery approaches, staff strengths, etc.

Anticipated outcomes would include:

- Increased acquisition of the core curriculum and higher level thinking skills by a greater number of students.
- Decrease in grade-level retention and dropout rate.
- Higher percentage of diplomas granted.
- Increased success rate for transition to post-secondary education and/or employment.
- Increased ability to successfully address the needs of a wider range of students within the framework of general education.

For the benefit of all students, the Task Force believes that special education, other categoricals and general education can and must interface in a more effective manner, while ensuring that categorical students are receiving services of appropriate intensity and quality to meet their needs. The intent is not to dilute current services provided, nor to change or abrogate due process rights.

Questions and Answers About a Unified System

The following questions and answers have been generated as a result of Task Force deliberations as well as discussions with other individuals. The intent of these questions and answers is to assist the reader to fully understand the Task Force's recommendations.

1. Are the Task Force's recommendations directed at any particular group of students?

   The Task Force kept as its focus the needs of the mildly and moderately handicapped students. Also considered were the needs of students who are at risk of failure in school, and yet do not meet the eligibility requirements of the various categorical programs, including special education.

2. What is an at-risk learner?

   An at-risk learner is any student who is having difficulty succeeding in school.

3. What is a unified system?

   A unified system is a coordinated collaborative effort among the entire staff at each school. A unified system will support student success and utilize all available resources, a choice of teaching strategies and a continuum of services.

4. Is a unified system the same thing as a School-Based Coordination Program Act (1981) developed and implemented under California Education Code Chapter 30, 52800 et seq.?

   No. A unified system is one wherein all personnel collaborate to bring the best possible services to all children in the school. The Task Force strongly recommends a wide range of possible models be examined prior to any school's development of their plan. However, this document should give some guidance to those wishing to implement a school-based coordinated program.

5. Is a unified system the consulting model?

   No. Consulting skills may be part of a unified system at a school site. Each school site should develop its own plan based on the needs of the students at the site, the strengths of the staff and available resources.

6. Who is responsible for the education of all students?

   Each staff member, certified and classified, at both the school and district level, shares responsibility for all students. Specific responsibilities should be designated in the school plan for a unified system.

7. Will all schools in California be required to develop a plan for a unifiedsystem?
   No. Schools should develop their plans at the time that is most appropriate for that school. The Task Force believes that successful plans are developed when schools wish to improve the education provided to all children.

8. Will all districts or schools be required to deliver all categorical programs?
   No. Each school should work with the categorical programs and other resources available to that school. Each school will choose, through the plan developed at that school, how to use the specific categorical resources available to it. Schools which have few resources other than district resources can still plan and implement a unified system.

9. Will all schools in California be required to immediately implement plans for unified systems?
   No. Pilot programs should be developed initially so that a variety of service delivery models can be disseminated statewide. Each school site will develop its own model depending on the needs of its students, the strengths of its staff, and available resources. Schools will change their service delivery models *only* after they have thoroughly planned a unified system.

10. Will reorganization of schools be required?
    In some instances, the school should continue in its present organization. In others, considerable reorganization may be undertaken. The amount of reorganization should depend upon the specific school plan.

11. What is the role of the District Board of Trustees?
    The Board of Trustees must adopt policy(ies) which give overall direction for the development of a unified system. They must allocate sufficient resources to implement the system. Each Board of Trustees must demand ongoing evaluation of the implementation of unified systems and direct resources for improvements as needed.

12. What is the role of district level administration?
    The superintendent and other district level administrators must give supportive leadership in developing and implementing school plans. They must keep Boards of Trustees informed of school plans as they are developed and implemented, and recommend the allocation of resources to implement and improve the plans.

13. What is the role of the bargaining unit?
    The bargaining unit's primary role is to negotiate a district-wide contract for its membership. School plans *must* be reviewed in light of the the negotiated contract to ascertain that the plan does not violate the contract. Procedures need to be developed to reconcile any differences.

14. If schools are reorganized to promote greater cooperation between general education, special education and other categorical programs, will mildly and moderately handicapped children receive only the core curriculum?
    No. Handicapped children will receive both the core curriculum and those services which are indicated in their IEPs.

15. What is the core curriculum?
    The term core curriculum refers to the course of study adopted by the school district and required for grade level promotion and graduation. It contains the requirements of Education Code 51225.3 and all the skills and knowledge by subject area and grade level which the district determines to be essential for every student to learn.

16. How will the core curriculum interface with the needs of mildly and moderately handicapped children and those children at risk of failure?
    It will be necessary for school districts to align all curricula, including, for example, special education curricula, bilingual curricula, etc. with the district's core curriculum.

17. Will in-service training on the core curriculum be required?
    Yes. The Task Force recommends that all administrative, certified and classified personnel participate jointly in in-service training.

18. Will maximum caseloads for resource specialists or speech and language specialists be changed?
    No. Resource specialist caseloads will remain at a maximum of 28. SELPA-wide average caseloads for speech and language specialists will remain at 55.

19. How will resource specialists serve non-identified children without increasing their caseloads?
    There are a variety of creative ways to solve this problem. Please refer to the section on funding for a complete discussion.

20. If caseloads for resource specialists were to be reduced in order to serve non-identified children, would funding be effected?
    Each school must take care to conform to current caseload requirements in order to avoid the recapture of Instructional Personnel Service Units (IPSU). Refer to the section on funding for a complete discussion.

21. Is the primary purpose of a unified system to save money?
    No. The purpose of the unified system is to meet the needs of all children, not save money.

22. What are the costs of implementing a unified system?
    There will be a varying amount of costs for planning. It is the intent of these recommendations that unified systems be implemented within the framework of existing resources available to each school. Although costs will vary from school to school, and may increase in some instances, some schools may find no additional resources will be needed.

23. Can federal resources be included in a unified system?
    Yes, but only in compliance with all federal laws and regulations.

24. Will changes in the Education Code be required?
    Permissive implementation of current legislation may be required. Legal barriers to the implementation of unified systems of delivery educational services to students must be identified and corrective legislation introduced as necessary.

25. Will the rights of special education students be diminished?
    No. Individuals with exceptional needs will receive all services specified in their IEPs.

26. Will the learning environment for all students be enhanced?
    Yes. A coordinated collaborative approach for meeting the needs of mildly and moderately handicapped students, as well as those at-risk of failure, will likely result in better services for all students.

27. What are the benefits of implementing a unified system?
    It is expected that there will be increased ability to address the needs of a wider range of students within the framework of general education; resulting in a decreased dropout rate, a higher number of students receiving high school diplomas and increased success for students in making the transition to post-secondary education or employment.

Safeguards

The area of safeguards is generally perceived to relate only to the protection of rights for special education students; however, in this document the rights of general education students and at-risk learners will also be addressed. Safeguards regarding the rights of staff also need to be acknowledged, maintained and/or expanded. Another important consideration is maintaining an appropriate and effective educational delivery system for all students in the general education program, while protecting the rights of the individual with exceptional needs. A crucial element is to maintain appropriate programming for the mildly/moderately handicapped student. A continuum of options needs to be available at school sites for all students at-risk, including special education students, while ensuring equal access to the core curriculum delivered as appropriate to the students' needs and in the least restrictive environment.

Issue One: Parent-student rights as identified by federal and California law. None of the specific components or discussions included in this document are intended to abrogate the rights guaranteed to parents and individuals with exceptional needs (IWENs). Included in these rights are such areas as: prior notice, parent consent to IEPs, "stay put" provisions, due process hearings and complaint procedures and the commitment for overall parent/student involvement in the IEP planning process.

Issue Two: How do the rights of the at-risk learner interact or impact on the rights guaranteed individuals with exceptional needs IWENs? At the current time the at-risk learner is not afforded those rights guaranteed to IWENs. However, the School-Based Program Coordination Act of 1981 (AB777), developed and implemented under California Education Code Chapter 30, Section 56000, et seq., is one mechanism that is available which permits special education and other categorical staff to serve non-identified at-risk learners. Even though no formal rights exist for the at-risk learner beyond those afforded general education students, a guiding principle of any delivery system must include a process for parent involvement and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Continue to utilize the existing School-Based Coordination Program Act of 1981(AB 777), developed and implemented under California Education Code Chapter 30, Section 56000, et seq.**

2. **Develop specific legislation that would protect the rights of the at-risk learner and provide a mechanism for those students to be served by special educational program(s) staff.**

3. **Parental/guardian involvement at the Student Study Team level and notification for a specific service/intervention could be utilized to allow specialized program staff to serve non-identified at-risk learners.**

4. **When an at-risk learner is being served by a specialized program staff member, there must be a mechanism in place to ensure parent(s)/ guardian(s) notification. It is desirable that there be a written description of an individualized program for the student.**

5. **Inherent in each of these alternatives is a need to provide a mechanism that would insure equitable treatment of special education staff; i.e. caseload minimum/maximums and a matching of the staff member's skills and abilities to the needs of the students to be served. Coordination with other categorical program staff members and other site level resources is critical to insure the success of the alternatives discussed above.**

6. **As the planning model is being developed it must include assurance statements that would include:**
   - **A. Procedural safeguard guarantees**
   - **B. Curricula appropriate to the needs of all students**
   - **C. Maximum delivery caseloads**
   - **D. Service delivery options**
   - **E. A process for ongoing evaluation**
   - **F. Staff development**

7. **Every school will need to develop a vehicle for planning that includes the school principal, staff, community and parents. Existing models include the School-Based Program Coodination (SBPC) Act and School Improvement Plan (SIP) School Site Councils as referenced in the Program Quality Review Guidelines. Regardless of the model utilized, there must be parity in representation.**

8. **Each school should develop data collection and monitoring systems to track all at-risk students. Periodic reviews of students' progress will need to be**

scheduled as well as ongoing evaluation of the data to determine program effectiveness.

9. Reconfiguration of service delivery systems as they impact job descriptions, personnel evaluations, caseload and/or class size maximums should be reviewed for consistency with the local collective bargaining agreements. When there are disagreements or inconsistencies between the school's plan and the local collective bargaining agreement, a process to resolve such situations must be developed. A recommendation is that the exclusive bargaining agent be consulted on areas impacting working conditions of employees.

10. Every effort should be made to protect the rights of staff members, including those who dissent from the school plan. This may be accomplished either by providing opportunities for transfer or the recognition of the right to a different opinion.

Funding

In examining the funding issues related to the General Education/Special Education Interface, there are three major issues: 1) Implications; 2) Sources of Funding; 3) Adequacy of Funding.

Issue One: Implications in the Current Funding System. Special education finance in the State of California is a complex and multifaceted funding model. It has developed over time to facilitate the delivery of special education to individuals with exceptional needs based on current federal and state law. In attempting to modify that system and enhance the interface of general and special education, the funding system must be studied carefully.

1. Study of current law
   It is important to understand what is permitted under current law, what is prohibited, and those areas where there is not a clear delineation. Some examples include:

   A. The caseload for resource specialists allows up to 28 students in the resources specialist program. Legal opinion has already indicated that 28 is interpreted as the total maximum caseload, including both identified and non-identified students.

   B. The Resource Specialist caseload is one of the factors that drives the funding mechanism both to qualify for increased funding through the Instructional Personnel Service Unit (IPSU) growth process and to avoid reducing funding through the IPSU recapture process.

2. Costs of implementation
   The second issue that has implications on the current funding system is the issue of incentives and disincentives. Special education funding of IPSU is currently driven by caseload factors. In order for a program to qualify for additional IPSUs, a program must average a certain number of students. Those programs falling below a designated number may face a reduction in funds. Therefore, administrators are encouraged to keep or increase caseloads in order to maintain the current level of service. Current thinking that encourages a general education/special education interface suggests that nonidentified students be served with those identified. No matter how much one might support this concept, if it reduces the capacity to fund the IPSU that is serving both sets of children, then it is a disincentive to the development of such interface.

Issue Two: Sources of Funding. Funding from all categorical programs, including special education, must be carefully studied at the local school site level, the regional level and the state level. If a unified system is to be effective, it needs to draw from all sources of funding in order to maximize the service delivery at the school site level.

> **Example:** Co-funding of a resource specialist program would be a possibility that could solve the issue of disincentives from the special education fiscal side. If the caseload of the resource specialist were to be 28, and 7 children were not formally identified as receiving special education services, then 25% of the Full Time Equivalent (FTE) teacher could be funded by a combination of categorical and general funds, or even other categorical fund dollars. This would allow special education to show a .75 FTE and thereby avoid the recapture and caseloading factors in our fiscal system. This would serve as an incentive and would encourage the cooperation necessary to implement a unified system.

Issue Three: Adequacy of Funding at State and Federal Levels. Special education funding has been designated by both state and federal law to serve only handicapped children. These funds have never been sufficient to completely fund statewide needs. In order to implement an interface, there must be guarantees that an equal number of dollars, even if comingled with funds from other sources, will flow directly to handicapped children rather than having an ever growing number of students who are not identified diluting the effectiveness of the programs. The ability to comingle funds at the local level and the impact of such an approach remains unclear. This will need clarification at both the federal and state level.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **The State Department of Education should undertake a study to allow waivers of the Education Code so that a specific school site caseload average may be reduced from 24 to 20 and still be able to maintain their Instructional Personnel Service Units (IPSU).**

2. **The waiver for adjustment of average caseload for speech, language and hearing specialists would need support from the district and SELPA to request State waivers to reduce the average caseload. The unit allocation plan at the SELPA level would have to allow some mechanism for exception or waiver.**

3. **There needs to be a recognition of the impact of a unified system on the SELPA level. Regionalized service and program specialists' income would allow some form of flexibility, so that other sources of income could fund portions of those services currently being provided through the regionalized services and program specialist dollars.**

   Example:
   Program specialists could be partially funded from general education funds, i.e., .75 FTE by special education and .25 FTE by the curriculum office.

   Example:
   Pooling of resources for services, such as Management Information Services (MIS) might be initiated. Unduplicated pupil count drives the amount of dollars received into the SELPA for regionalized service and program specialists. This would again encourage a higher caseload, i.e., a SELPA which operated 100 resource specialist programs with an average caseload of 24, would receive regionalized service dollars based on 2400 students. If the average identified caseloads of resource specialists dropped to 20, those dollars earned would be based on 2000 students. At $91 per student, that difference of 400 children would mean $36,400 reduction at the SELPA level. This could lead to a reduction in existing services and thus be a disincentive.

4. **A unified system would need to provide funds to offset the loss through special education, while providing additional funding to encourage the development of this concept through quality staff review. Federal dollars would be reduced through the loss of identified special education students. The California State Department of Education would need to communicate with the federal government to explore mechanisms to avoid the loss of these funds.**

5. **Implementation of major change, both at the school site level or from the perspective of statewide change, involves a critical analysis of the costs involved with the proposed implementation. The Task Force recommends that there be pilots to study costs associated with school-based coordination and general education/ special education interface.**

Governance

Issue One: Recognition of current legal requirements, Public Law 94-142, and California Law, as found in Education Code Chapter 30, Section 56000, et seq. must be addressed. The legal requirements of federal and state law need to be examined carefully by legal counsel and, if appropriate, should be modified to allow greater flexibility at the levels of governance. Such analysis should include a clarification of what is currently allowed, what is expressly prohibited, what are the uncertain areas, what are the recommended legal changes and at which levels, in order to encourage and implement a unified system of service delivery and, where appropriate, school-based coordination of programs.

Issue Two: Roles and responsibilities, and restrictions from each level of government (i.e., the federal, state, SELPA, county office of education, district, school site and community) need to be clarified. At the district level, the superintendent, as well as staff, need to be clearly aware of their roles. At the site, the school site council, the parents, the principals, the teachers, the classified staff, and the students all need to be working cooperatively in order to improve the interface of all educational programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **A specific delineation of the roles and responsibilities of each level of government within the structure needs to be defined in order to promote a unified system.**

2. **A clarification of the federal government's support for this position. The State Department of Education should continue to give direction beyond the existing Program Advisory, including assistance at the SELPA level for how the SELPA can most effectively interface with individual districts and/or schools implementing this program.**

3. **Local school boards and superintendents need to review the plan to analyze for consistency with district policy and procedures and develop a process to rectify any inconsistencies.**

4. **The school site council and the power of the principal to allocate funds to specific types of children must be clarified.**

5. **All appropriate parties receive assurances and guarantees that the same level of quality or an improved quality of service through the new delivery system must be achieved for individuals with exceptional needs.**

6. **Awareness and support in the community as a whole is a critical factor in the success of any change in an educational system.**

7. **The school principal in conjunction with the district recognizes and assures that all staff are accountable for all students and demonstrates a commitment to joint ownership of the program.**

8. **Joint planning between school-site and other involved agencies and educational programs dealing with at-risk students will occur. For example, court school, community school, county office of education and SB 65 programs.**

9. **School site flexibility and responsibility are the two key ingredients in implementing a program. The governance structures, each at their own level, must exemplify these two characteristics in how they approach a unified system.**

Core Curriculum

Defining the Core Curriculum for All Students: Core curriculum refers to the district or school adopted course of study required for grade-level promotion and graduation. It includes, within the context of the curricular requirements in the Education Code, all the skills and knowledge by subject area and grade level which the district determines to be essential for every student to learn.

Issue One: Concepts regarding the relationship of the core curriculum to special education.

1. All students should be instructed in the concepts of the core curriculum in accordance with their level of understanding.

2. Students should receive instruction in the main concepts of the core curriculum in the general education classroom. This instruction is supplemented by the special education program.

Issue Two: One core curriculum concept is the "relation of the individual to society." This concept is contained in both the literature and history frameworks.

1. The concept should be introduced in the general education classroom.

2. The special education teacher may supplement, for example, by adapting the materials or providing small group instruction. Another approach may be to give the prerequisite information to the special education student before the concept is introduced in the general classroom.

3. The classroom teacher and the special education teacher should collaborate on a regular basis on the delivery of the core curriculum as to what major concepts are to be introduced and when.

Issue Three: The collaboration could take the form of a written note, hallway conference, formal meeting, etc. For example, there are four major components in the visual and performing arts framework. One of these is creative expression. In drama the general education teacher may introduce student improvisations. She/he may consult with the special education teacher to decide the best way for the student to be successful in this activity.

1. It is not expected that the special education teacher has the time or training to be able to instruct in all the curriculum areas of the core curriculum. The special education teacher is to know the general concepts, understand the sequence of teaching the concepts at a particular site/district and support the student and the regular education teacher in the instruction and learning of the concept.

2. The special education teacher is not primarily a remedial teacher, but may be teaching the student coping techniques in order to deal with the handicap or using different teaching strategies to instruct the student. Additionally, the special education and regular education teacher are sharing various teaching strategies with each other.

3. Preservice training needs to include instruction in the concepts and content of the core curriculum as well as strategies for its delivery to a diverse student population.

4. All teachers, general and special, need to be aware of the major components from each curricula area as presented in the State frameworks and district curriculum.

5. All teachers need to develop and practice various instructional delivery strategies meeting the needs of diverse students within a classroom.

6. The planning of the conceptualization and implementation of the core curriculum at the district and school level should include representatives from all general and categorical or special instructional staff.

   Example:
   Inservice on science framework should be given to *all* staff at the school, making sure all categorical program staff participate.

8. IEP's should be based on, but not limited to, the State frameworks and district curriculum.

Issue Four: The curriculum required for special education students includes areas such as transition, life skills, vocational education, adaptive physical education, social-emotional development, etc., beyond those which are commonly identified as core curriculum (language arts, math, science, etc.)

Delivering the Core Curriculum to All Students: Core curriculum refers to the district or school adopted "course of study" required for grade promotion and graduation. It includes, within the context of the curricular requirements in the Education Code, all the skills and knowledge by subject area and grade level, which the district determines to be essential for every student to learn. This curriculum may include academic as well as cultural, social, and moral knowledge and skills.

Issue One: All students should be instructed in the concepts of the core curriculum in accordance with their level of understanding. Students should receive instruction in the major concepts of the core curriculum in the setting most appropriate to the student. This instruction may be supplemented and reinforced by other specialized programs.

("Supplemented" is defined in the *Program Advisory on the Integrated Program Items* dated 11/16/87 as: "The practice of providing extra resources and services, in addition to what the district already provides, which are specifically designed to help eligible students better learn the district's core curriculum. The intent of supplementary services and resources is to 'enrich' rather than to 'replace' the district core curriculum and instructional delivery systems.")

Issue Two: Modifications of the core curriculum, instructional strategies and techniques, may be necessary to meet the needs of individual students. It needs to be understood that both special education and at-risk students may need more time to master the major concepts. Grade level expectancies and grading policies must be flexible.

1. The specialists and general education teachers share a variety of teaching strategies. A collaboration of these strategies would be more effective in meeting the needs of diverse students within a program.

2. All teachers, general and special, need to be aware of the major components from each core curriculum area as presented in the State frameworks and district courses of study.

3. Conscious decisions regarding major concepts of the curriculum must be made in developing courses of study at the district level and at the school site level for individual students. The curriculum required for special education and at-risk students may need to be expanded beyond the core curriculum to include areas such as: transition, life skills, vocational education, adaptive physical education, and social-emotional development.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **The classroom teacher and the specialists should collaborate on a regular basis on the delivery of the core curriculum. The collaboration should take the form of a planned activity during the regular work day. This means that the teachers and specialists should not be required to meet during duty-free time.**

2. **The specialist should know the general concepts, understand the sequence of teaching the concepts in the district course of study, and support the student and the regular education teacher, when appropriate, in the instruction and learning of the concepts.**

3. **All teacher training needs to include instruction in the core curriculum and a range of strategies for its delivery to a diverse student population.**

4. **The planning of the core curriculum at the district and school level should include representatives from all general and categorical or special instruction staff.**

5. **The concept should be introduced in the general education classroom as the first choice, but if not appropriate, the concepts may be introduced in other settings such as the learning handicap-special day classes, bilingual programs, and resource specialist programs.**

Personnel Development

Preservice Training Programs

Issue One: General Education Credential Programs. The general and special education interface pertaining to service programs cannot be complete without an examination of preservice training at the university level. Currently there is only one special education requirement for a general education credential. This consists of a "mainstreaming course." Although each course must meet Commission on Teacher Credentialing Mainstreaming Competencies, the content for each class may vary widely. This course requirement is inadequate to equip the teacher-candidate with the necessary skills to effectively meet the needs of an at-risk student.

Issue Two: Special services training programs must restructure the core of their programs and include competencies which address the general education/special education interface. Candidates need to acquire skills which will better prepare them for the tasks of collaboration, consultation and joint teaching responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

We recommend that all general education credential programs, administrative services, special education specialist and clinical rehabilitation services, pupil personnel, school psychology, social work and counseling credential programs include, but not be limited to, minimum competency in:

1. **Knowledge of handicapping conditions.**
2. **Behavior management.**
3. **Parent counseling.**
4. **Instructional strategies and curriculum.**
5. **Core curriculum and its application.**
6. **Knowledge of various models which integrate special education services with general education services and the varied roles within each model.**

7. **Practical skills for preparing students for the transition from school to work and equipping those students in the skills necessary for specific positions in industry, public service or business.**

8. **Communication skills, consulting skills and team collaboration.**

9. **Curriculum-based assessment and evaluation of individual rates of learning.**

10. **Data collection skills.**

11. **Knowledge of other categorical programs and their implementation at the site level, and specific skills pertaining to specialty areas.**

12. **Student teaching in classrooms that include students with special needs.**

13. **Instruction at the university level should be taught by individuals having background in each of the above areas.**

Inservice Training Programs

Issue One: All facets of education need to recognize *inservice as a priority* to produce the changes needed to implement a unified system and modify existing systems. Inservice needs to be supported by funds and personnel time.

Issue Two: Incentives relating to personnel development and the imple-mentation of inservice training programs need to be built into state, regional, county, district and school site plans. The incentives should be set up to motivate program development and raise the awareness level of the need for change.

Issue Three: Local school sites need access to information and resources to plan and implement effective inservice.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Inservice training should include all facets of education in a collaborative process among local education agencies, institutions of higher education and state agencies. This process should include planning, resource provision, implementation and evaluation.**

2. **Inservice training should relate to the collaborative function of the school site. The school site plan should describe inservice needs and an inservice plan.**

3. **There should be a comprehensive plan described to provide information and resources in an organized manner at all levels (state, regional, district and site) so that there will be a variety of resources available to the school site as they do the planning and implementing of their school plan and program.**

4. **The time for inservice training should be available without having to cut down in the instructional time with students.**

5. **Inservice training should include, at a minimum, an expansion and extension of the basic competencies first identified within preservice training.**

Staffing

Issue One: The most pivotal point in students' education is their positive contact with the school staff. This contact is crucial to each child's individual development. It is therefore important that all school staff take responsibility for the successful education of all students. The critical elements for staffing a unified system are as follows:

1. Administrative leadership to support program implementation is an absolute requirement at the state, county, SELPA, district and local school site levels.

2. Staff commitment to the philosophy of meeting the educational needs of all students.

3. Commitment to facilitate and provide for staff planning during the regular instructional day.

4. Commitment to provide for ongoing staff development, training and collaboration. It is suggested that this be provided on a regularly scheduled basis.

5. A written plan to identify the school sites specific staffing needs in order to deliver a comprehensive program to all students. This should identify what kinds and numbers of staff (support staff, paraprofessionals, volunteers, etc.) are needed, as well as identifying the strengths and weaknesses of current staff.

6. Utilization of unique expertise and skills of all existing staff to include all regularly assigned staff (certificated, classified and volunteers).

7. Based on staff's strengths and weaknesses, an inservice plan should be developed to include a wide variety of instructional strategies.

8. An emphasis must be placed on the delivery of services/instruction based on student needs. This approach must ensure the coordination of instruction and services for each student.

9. The realization that a unified delivery system may require additional funding or a redistribution of existing funds.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Designate a process for the identification and on-going support for students who are at-risk. The current Student Study Team model is one example of such a process.**

2. **Designate an individual who will provide the case management role of an identified student. This should include guiding, monitoring, ensuring success and evaluating an individual child's program.**

3. **Ensure that the school site developed plan includes not only the specifics for delivery of various instructional components, but also a set of working procedures that will provide for communication and collaboration among staff.**

4. **Develop a plan that allows for the gradual implementation of the program components identified at each school site. The site staff may wish to implement the components on a variable scale rather than all at once.**

5. **Utilize available school and community resources, including but not limited to cross-age/peer tutors, foster grandparents, parent volunteers, businesses, agencies, college and university students and others.**

6. **Define the role and responsibilities of support staff and disseminate to all staff.**

7. **For those schools served by itinerant support staff, there may be some limitations to their participation in the plan. However, they should always be given the opportunity to participate in developing and being a part of the plan if they so choose.**

Implementation

Issue One: One of the charges of the Task Force was to develop a new or revised delivery system(s) to be used at the school site level which would promote maximum interaction between general education and special education. The Task Force believes there is no single model that can be generalized to service all of California. It is critical for each school site to develop its own unification plan, reflective of its needs, resources and strengths.

Issue Two: There is wide variation in current practices of alternative instructional delivery system for mildly and moderately handicapped students, as well as other categorical programs and services throughout California and the nation. In the course of developing a range of revised and/or new service delivery models, allowing for maximum interaction between special education and general education, a review of current practices and research pilots in progress reveals that there is no one best "omnibus" model that could be implemented at any given school site. What becomes obvious is that there are elements or components common to best educational practices depicted by local implementation of various types of alternative instructional delivery (methods). In view of the dynamic nature of schools, the type of instruction and allocation of resources will be determined by one degree of flexibility and the forces of change at work within each local school site.

Issue Three: Establishment of methods for communication must occur at all levels. Communication must be two-way and ongoing. Communication avenues must be readily available to all involved persons: parents, teachers, students, specialists, administrators and other school personnel.

Issue Four: Planning time is equally as important as instructional time. Implementation must be a result of planning. Planning must occur before implementation and throughout implementation. Collaborative planning must occur at all levels: school site, district, SELPA, and state. A plan must be developed that includes what services are to be delivered and to whom, who will deliver the services, and how the services are to be delivered.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **A commitment by the school site team to plan and develop a unified system to meet the needs of all students.**

2. **Planning must include all involved persons: parents, teachers, students, specialists, administrators and other school personnel.**

3. **School site leadership must assume responsibility for school site planning and implementation.**

4. **All members of the staff, as members of the School Site Team, shall assume responsibility for planning and implementation.**

5. **The school site plan should be a dynamic, evolving system which allows for change as the needs of the student population and staff change.**

Issue Five: Assessment of personnel strengths, needs of students and learning environments.

1. Assessment of personnel at the site level should include identification and coordination of staff strengths in meeting students' needs.

2. Assessment of needs of students be addressed at the school site, through a well defined collaborative team process (e.g., Student Study Team)

3. A range of assessment approaches which focuses on addressing effective instructional strategies and the development of an appropriate learning environment should be stressed.

Issue Six: Personnel development must be an ongoing process during planning and implementation. Personnel development activities must be connected to the needs of the staff, particularly during the change process. Adequate time for team planning, staff development and inservice should be allotted.

Issue Seven: Instruction can be provided or supported by the general classroom teacher, special education teacher, teachers of other categories, paraprofessionals, instructional aides, volunteers, student teachers, college student tutors, senior tutors, etc.

1. The instructional delivery component should be determined through a collaborative team effort which provides for coordination of services and is supported by an ongoing process of consultation, modeling, coaching and/or direct services. Best practice options for instructional delivery include:

   A. Team approaches and strategies such as cooperative learning, cross-age/peer tutoring, jigsaws, helping trio, etc.

   B. Cross-grade level grouping for instructional needs.

   C. Whole class instruction which can include co-teaching, team teaching.

   D. Small group instruction in class.

   E. Individualized instruction in class.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Special education and other categorical programs and services should actively support the success of all students in the core curriculum in the regular classroom.**

2. **Students' educational needs are met within the general classroom setting whenever possible, utilizing whatever support staff and instructional strategies determined appropriate, regardless of the students' qualifications for categorical services or money.**

3. **Programs and services which take students out of the general classroom environment (pull out) may be part of a continuum of services at the school site, but only utilized when it is determined that the same program and/or services cannot be provided in the general classroom setting (e.g., small groups, counseling).**

4. **A commitment by the school site to have consistent expectations in the areas of adherence to core curriculum, quality instruction and successful student performance.**

5. **Availability and flexibility of a range of instructional approaches in instructional delivery, instructional curriculum and location of instruction.**

Issue Eight: While the goal for each student is to be successful with the core curriculum, there may be needs outside the core curriculum area which must also be addressed to help students be successful in the educational system. The continuum of best practices options in curriculum should include:

1. Core curriculum
2. Modified core curriculum
3. Alternative curriculum (life skills, vocational education, specific skills related to low incidence handicaps, etc.)
4. Learning Strategies
   A. Developing higher cognitive skills
   B. Developing knowledge structures and strategies for learning how to learn
   C. Strategies Intervention Model (SIM)
   D. Organizational skills
   E. Critical thinking skills
5. Social skills curriculum

Issue Nine: The success of a student in the educational system implies that the student is successful within the general class setting. However, there may be specific needs that students have that simply cannot be met in a general classroom environment. Coordination of services for students needing additional support to be successful should consider the location of instruction as well as the curriculum and delivery. Best practices emphasize maximum utilization of the general classroom. Instruction outside the general class setting may be appropriate for providing individual and small group instruction. The following are examples of skills/activities which may need a setting other than the general classroom:

1. Counseling/social skills development
2. Low incidence handicap services
3. Speech services
4. Some services for students with learning problems (i.e. attention deficit, learning disability)

5. Monitored study hall
6. Research/special projects for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) students
7. Instruction related to the needs of bilingual students

Issue Ten: Evaluation must be an integral part of any implementation plan. It should be ongoing and utilized at each stage in any sequence of implementation activities. Decisions for modification of the unified system should be based on accurate analysis of evaluation data.

Evaluation

Issue One: Evaluation is an essential part of an implementation plan. Effective evaluation provides information and data which can be utilized to determine program effectiveness, areas for further study and areas needing changes or modification.

1. The Task Force members believe that if its recommendations are to be implemented, they can and must be evaluated. This evaluation should occur at all levels: state, SELPA, district, and school site.

2. Each level must develop its own evaluation plan. The plans should be specific to the responsibilities for that level and should not rely solely upon school site data.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The purpose of all evaluation plans should be constructive. The plan for each level should be designed to gather data to be utilized for improving and expanding the unified system. The following recommendations are presented to assist each level in developing a comprehensive evaluation plan. These recommendations are not exclusive of other areas which may be considered appropriate for study. The following should be considered in the development of an evaluation plan:

1. Is there a direct correlation between the program design/objectives and what is to be evaluated?

2. Is there a direct correlation between the evaluation plan and other state evaluative instruments?

3. Are there short-term components within a long-term evaluation plan?

4. Are multidimensional measures being utilized for collecting data?

5. Can the areas to be evaluated actually be measured?

6. Are several different components of the school program being evaluated?

7. Have the evaluation questions been identified before implementation?

8. Is the evaluation plan efficient?

STATE-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS:

The State must develop an evaluation plan which directly correlates with its own responsibilities. Initially, this plan should focus on state-level issues and rely on site data. The following are suggested areas for consideration:

1. Interface between special education and other departments: The Task Force strongly recommends improved communication and planning between the various departments in the State Department of Education. A plan must be developed identifying major implementation areas and subsequently, components/elements for evaluation within the Department, not the field.

2. Governance, funding and safeguards: The recommendations of the Task Force can only be implemented if there are changes in governance, funding and safeguards. To a marked degree, the Task Force has already identified specific areas requiring change. The Department must further analyze these data and determine an action plan. The success of this plan can be evaluated on the basis of short-term and long-term objectives.

    A. Short-term objectives may be evaluated by changes in legislation, department policies and/or funding mechanisms.

    B. Long term objectives may be evaluated by determining the impact of the changes on the field. This could be accomplished through pilot projects or sample field data.

    C. An evaluation/program of cost effectiveness could be completed by the Department of Finance.

3. Communication to the field: The implementation of any new concept requires clear and specific communication with the field. It is recommended that the Department evaluate its own communication strategies. Suggested areas for consideration include:

    A. Quality of written communications
    B. Timelines of written communications
    C. Procedures for dissemination of pilot information
    D. Department generated staff development
    E. Availability of consultive services
    F. Prior notification of evaluation data to be collected
    G. Means of receiving consistent and reliable input/feedback from the field

4. Development of pilot projects: The Task Force recommends that the Department implement pilot projects. All pilot projects should have an evaluation plan designed to identify and gather on issues specifically related to field implementation of a successful unified system. Evaluation plans should include the following:

    A. Cost effectiveness
    B. Board policies
    C. District procedures
    D. Utilization of state and district resources
    E. Inservice and staff development
    F. Parent education and involvement
    G. Student performance and measurement of success

DISTRICT-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS

Once a district-level implementation plan has been developed utilizing the suggestions in the implementation section of this paper, the following should be considered in the district evaluation plan:

1. Board policies:
    A. Are district policies compatible with the implementation plan?
    B. Do new or rewritten policies:
        1) Comply with state and federal mandates?
        2) Comply with local employees contracts?
        3) Define decision making rights and responsibilities of school sites?

2. Procedures:
    A. Do personnel procedures protect staff rights?
        1) Job descriptions
        2) Evaluation procedures
        3) Assignment options
    B. Is there a means of determining the success of technical assistance to local sites?
        1) Data gathering
        2) Staff development
        3) Compliance/quality reviews
        4) Funding issues
        5) Parent involvement

SCHOOL SITE RECOMMENDATIONS:

A successful implementation plan and delivery system of services for students contains multiple components. At least one element from each component should be evaluated in order to provide comprehensive data. The school site should develop an evaluation plan which gathers data specific to its implementation plan, objectives and program design.

1. Services delivery system:
   - A. Currently identified students. Have the services for these students 1) remained the same; 2) increased; 3) decreased?
   - B. Are students receiving services from the 1) same source; 2) different sources; or 3) more than one source?
   - C. Has the location of the service delivery changed? If so, what is the impact?

2. Services for students formerly unserved:
   - A. How are at-risk students identified?
   - B. Who delivers the service?
   - C. Where are the services being provided?
   - D. How frequently are the services provided?

3. Additional areas:
   - A. What new services and/or resources have been identified?
   - B. Does the school offer a continuum of services?
   - C. Has a range of intervention been identified?
     1) How often are they being used?
     2) What is their impact?

4. Inservice/staff development:
   - A. Orientation
     1) Were all the involved groups, including parents, provided initial orientation on the meaning of the unified system?
     2) Was the orientation effective?
     3) Was there ample opportunity for discussion of expectations?
     4) Was there ample opportunity for discussion of possible goals and objectives?
   - B. Planning staff development
     1) Is the staff development plan based upon a needs assessment? If so, who was involved?
     2) Was the needs assessment data utilized in determining staff development?
     3) Were the information and recommendations received from

California Assessment Program (CAP), Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR), program reviews, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) incorporated into staff development?

5. Parent education/involvement
   A. Parent Workshops/Conferences
      1) Were parents involved in planning content for parent workshops?
      2) Has there been variety in the format for parent workshops?
      3) Was there flexible scheduling for the workshops?
      4) Are the workshops related to the program objectives?
      5) What is the level of parent attendance at workshops/conferences?
      6) Are the parents attending representative of the school population?

6. Student performance/success
   A. General classroom involvement:
      1) To what degree are special education students in general classes?
      2) How successful are all the target students?
      3) To what degrees are target students receiving the core program?
      4) To what degree are target students receiving higher level cognitive training?

   B. Extracurricular involvement
      1) What is the level of participation in school activities?
      2) What changes have been made in school activities to ensure participation?
      3) Have student attitudes toward participation changed?

7. Means of assessment
   A. What tests are used to monitor student progress?
   B. Have alternative methods of assessment been used to determine student progress? What are they? What useful information do they provide?

8. Student achievement
   A. What is the grade level growth of students?
   B. What is the school's retention rate?
   C. What percentage of students graduate?
   D. What is the school's dropout rate?
   E. Have the student attitudes toward learning changed?

SPECIAL NOTE: It is recognized that school sites may not have the resources and/or expertise to develop and implement an appropriate evaluation plan. It is recommended that the State Department of Education provide sample questionnaires, surveys and suggested strategies to assist schools.

References

Agenda for the twenty-first century: A blueprint for K-12 education. (1987). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Aloia, G. F. (1983). Special educators' perceptions of their roles as consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 6* (2), 83-87.

Anderegg, M. L. (1988). An analysis of one of the cornerstones of the regular education initiative. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 20* (8), 1-7.

Birdsall, P. M., & Tolbert, L. G., (1983). *Documentation of model programs for the implementation of Assembly Bill 777 (School-Based Coordination Act).* Public Policy Research, Inc.

Friend, M. (1984). Consulting skills for resource teachers. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 1* (3), 246-250.

Gartner, A. & Lipsky, D. K. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. *Harvard Educational Review, 57* (4), 367-395.

Haight, S. L. (1984). Special education teacher consultant: Idealism versus realism. *Exceptional Children, 50* (6), 507-515.

Idol-Maestas, L. (1984). A follow-up study of resource/consulting teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 8,* 121-131.

Lieberman, L. M., (1985). Special education and regular education: A merger made in heaven? *Exceptional Children, 51* (6), 513-516.

Mesinger, J. F. (1985). Commentary on "A rationale for the merger of regular and special education" or, Is it now time for the lamb to lie down with the lion? *Exceptional Children, 51* (6), 510-512.

A new future for children with substantial handicaps: The second wave of least restrictive environment. (1986). Indiana State Department of Education.

Program quality review for elementary schools: Process, criteria and self study. (1987). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Salend, S. (1984). Factors contributing to the development of successful mainstreaming programs. *Exceptional Children, 50* (5), 409-416.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1985). The merger of special and education: Can it be done? A response to Lieberman and Mesinger. *Exceptional Children, 51* (6), 517-521.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special education and regular education. *Exceptional Children, 51* (2), 102-111.

Teacher Education Division-Council for Exceptional Children. (1986). *A statement by the Teacher Education Division-Council for Exceptional Children on the Regular Education Initiative.* Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Vasquez-Chairez, M. & MacMillan, R. (1988). Collaborative consultation among school administers, specialists, and regular classroom teachers in creating school-site change. *Thrust: Journal of the Association of California School Administrators.*

Vasquez-Chairez, M. (1987). *Participation of school districts in the school-based program coordination act: A report to the legislature as required by the 1987-88 budget act.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Wang, M. C., & Birch, J. W. (1984). Comparison of a full-time mainstreaming program and a resource room approach, *Exceptional Children, 51* (1), 11-40.

Wang, M. C., & Birch, J. W. (1984). Effective special education in regular classes. *Exceptional Children, 50* (5), 391-398.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1986, July). *Reflections on research and practices in special education: A case of disjointedness.* Position paper prepared for discussion at a Wingspread conference in Racine, Wisconsin.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1985, December). *Rethinking special education.* Position paper prepared for discussion at a Wingspread conference in Racine, Wisconsin.

Wang, M. C., & Reynolds, M. C. (1985). Avoiding the "Catch 22" in special education reform. *Exceptional Children, 51* (6), 497-502.

Wang, M C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (in press). *The handbook of special education: Research and practice.* Oxford: Pergamon Press LTD.

Wang, M. C., Rubenstein, J.L., & Reynolds, M. C. (1985). Clearing the road to success for students with special needs. *Educational Leadership, (42),* 62-67.

Will, M. (1984). Let us pause and reflect-but not too long. *Exceptional Children (49),* 246-252.

Glossary

The following is a list of words or phrases used by the Task Force in developing and writing this report. Many of these explanations and/or definitions pertain only to this report and are not necessarily meant as universal or absolute definitions.

1. **All Students**
   Students who may attend a public school program.

2. **Alternative Delivery System**
   Any system or method that attempts to improve upon the existing traditional in-classroom instruction with segregated, categorical pull-out services.

3. **At-Risk Students/At-Risk Learners**
   Students who are not successful in the current educational system.

4. **Caseloads**
   Minimum and/or maximum number of students to be served in a specific program as determined by the State Education Code (i.e. RSP 28, Speech/ Language 55).

5. **Collaboration**
   "An interactive process which enables people with diverse expertise to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems, the outcome is enhanced, altered and different from the original solutions that any team member would produce independently." (Idol-Maestas, Nevin, Paolucci-Whitcomb, 1985, p.i.)

6. **Consultation**
   A process for providing services to at-risk learners in which support staff collaborate with regular education staff, other school professionals and/or paraprofessionals and parents to plan, implement and evaluate interventions carried out in the regular classroom for the purpose of ensuring each student success in the educational system.

7. **Core Curriculum**
   The term "core curriculum" refers to the course of study adopted by the school district and required for grade level promotion and graduation. It contains the requirements of Education Code 51225.3 and all the skills and knowledge by subject area and grade level which the district determines to be essential for every student to learn.

8. **Instructional Delivery**
   Methods, including strategies, in which instruction is presented to the students.

9. **Mainstreaming**
   Student participating in the regular/general education setting with regular education peers.

10. **Model Programs**
    An alternative delivery system which has been implemented at a local school site and has demonstrated excellence and success in meeting students needs.

11. **Pilot Programs**
    A plan developed by a local school site which would include implementing an alternative delivery system based on best educational practices with the intent to better meet the educational needs of all students at the site. A pilot program should be based on research, training/inservicing staff needs and ongoing evaluation of the plan based on the success of the students within the system.

12. **Planning Team**
    A school site planning team should include all members of the staff (certificated—including itinerant, classified, volunteers) and parents.

13. **School-Based Program Coordination Act of 1981 (AB 777)**
    This act gives schools greater flexibility to coordinate categorical funds (see program advisory).

14. **School Site Council**
    See School-Based Program Coordination Act, Article 3 , Section 52852. School Site Composition.

15. **Support Staff**
    Usually refers to the professional staff with specific expertise in a specialized area such as bilingual, special education, reading specialist, etc.

16. **Unified System**
    A unified system is a coordinated collaborative effort among the entire staff at each school. A unified system will support student success and utilize all available resources, a choice of teaching strategies and a continuum of services.